

Date: Sat, 24 Jul 93 16:16:35 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #251
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 24 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 251

Today's Topics:

 ARRL opposes temporary permits
 Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer
 Kids aren't supposed to know anything, right?
 Order pizza on your autopatch now
 Policy of Reverse Autopatches, anything new?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 22 Jul 1993 17:02:01 GMT
From: olivea!korie!west.West.Sun.COM!11-a!flloyd@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL opposes temporary permits
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>SB QST @ ARL \$ARLB075
>ARLB075 Board meeting news
>
>ZCZC AG17
>QST de W1AW
>ARRL Bulletin 75 ARLB075
>>From ARRL Headquarters
>Newington CT July 18, 1993
>To all radio amateurs
>
>SB QST ARL ARLB075
>ARLB075 Board meeting news
>

>The ARRL Board of Directors met in Windsor Locks, Connecticut, July
>16-17. The following is a summary of the actions taken:

>

> ...

>

>The Board committed League support for the FCC efforts to implement
>electronic filing of license and upgrade applications. The General
>Counsel was directed to file comments opposing any attempt by any
>authority, other than FCC, to provide a point-of-examination
>temporary operating authority.

Hmmm. Here they (the ARRL) go again, blind-siding us with a policy position before having allowed sufficient (any?) time for open debate. Now in a preemptive strike they've deployed their legal SWAT team to file an opposition paper against allowing the issuance of temporary callsigns by the VE's.

Now darn it, I feel that if a person passes the test then they are entitled to the privlidges. When I got my first license I was no more qualified after waiting 10 weeks for the license than I was right after I took the test. The same applies for driver's licenses. Let's face it, you're more likely to kill somebody in a car than you are with an HT. I only learned of the proposed temporary callsign idea a couple of weeks ago (here on the net) and now, while still in gestation stage, the Board preemptively stomps their big ugly foot down on the proposal.

I don't think this issue has had enough exposure to the general ham population to warrant such a swift position by the league.

>

>The Board endorsed the concept of an international Amateur Radio
>permit, similar in nature to the international driver's license. It
>urged that the foundation be laid for the submission of a proposal
>to create such a permit to a future ITU conference.

>

And then, in amazement, I read the above! Yes, they'll fight temporary, VE-issued callsigns and yet are more than willing to pass the authority of issuing an international license to any state which can claim international sovereignty. Need an international license, no problem! Just visit or perhaps just send \$40 to some third world bureaucrat from Outer Slobovia and you're on your way. In other words, they don't trust our own VE's, but are perfectly willing to let unspecified offshore governments issue licenses.

Now I'm certain that there will be many which disagree with my opinions

as stated above. Fine, I expect this. But it seems to me that the ARRL routinely makes influential decisions which affect hundreds of thousands of hams each year without asking us of our opinions.

Why doesn't the ARRL take opinion polls? The very idea that we elect representative members to voice our opinions is anachronistic at best. Has the ARRL ever held a general vote of the membership? Why can't the ARRL poll its membership? Why does it continue to hold on to the decidedly disrepresentative method of governing?

I'll be the first to admit that I don't know who my local section manager is. I didn't vote at all in the last local section election. I don't think that it's possible for anyone other than myself to represent my views when it comes to voting for change. There could not have possibly been a nominee who represented my views on all of the issues which might arise. Why then, should I compromise by voting for a candidate which possibly represented some of my views?

I would say that I'm not in the minority of members who do not vote under the current system. Given that the ARRL influences decisions which affect all hams, not just ARRL members, then one must conclude that as a group (hams) we are decidedly underrepresented. Let's assume (please prove me wrong) that 1 in 10 ARRL members vote in the section elections. Given that the ARRL represents about a third of all hams, then the voting population represents one thirtieth of all hams. And to top this off, this 1/30 group does not vote on issues at all. It votes for people who will decide the issues for them. If there were a general elections among all ARRL members, not only would the ordinary joe actually have a real vote on issues, but the actual representation in the process would increase by as much as an order of magnitude.

It couldn't be that difficult for the ARRL to hold general elections. I get mail-in ballots cards once a year from several companies for which I'm a stock holder. Presumably, as a [member] I'm a 'stock holder' in the ARRL too. I get numerous mailings from the League each year, how much could it cost them to do a mass ballot? I suspect that cost is not the issue, but rather the desire by those currently in power not to dilute their considerable influence by the whims and will of the unwashed masses.

-fred

[Fred Lloyd, AA7BQ
[Sun Microsystems,
[Phoenix, AZ

Fred.Lloyd@west.sun.com]
Systems Engineer]
(602) 224-3517]

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 1993 21:05:56 GMT
From: news.service.uci.edu!ttinews!calvin.tti.com!cole@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Fgm27B1w165w@nj8j.atl.ga.us> ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us (Ben Coleman) writes:

>Subject: Re: Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer

>From: ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us (Ben Coleman)

>Date: Wed, 21 Jul 93 16:05:50 -0400

>dstock@hpqmoca.sqf.hp.com (David Stockton) writes:

>

>> What will the FCC do when their old mainframe finally dies ?

>

>My understanding is that when the FCC finally retires that ol' klunker, the

>Smithsonian wants it! Probably for their antique-computer collection. :-)

>

>Ben

They should take it to the local hamfest or flea market and sell it.
It probably has a BUNCH of usable tubes in it :-)

Randy

Date: 20 Jul 93 22:50:44 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!dragon!nj8j!ben@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Kids aren't supposed to know anything, right?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

> The push to get the no-code license passed was not to swell the ranks
> "to protect bandwidth" (most no-coders live on 2mtrs), but rather to
> increase the ranks so more V/UHF equipment could be sold, and higher
> advertising rates could be charged in QST.

Do you have any evidence for this, or are you just Bulverising (as is all
too common today)? I'm not inclined to believe mere speculations about
the motives of people you probably don't know.

Ben

Ben Coleman NJ8J	"All that is not eternal is
AX.25: NJ8J@W4QO.#EAL.#ATL.GA.USA.NA	eternally irrelevant."
Internet: ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us	C. S. Lewis

+-----+

Date: 24 Jul 1993 00:39:20 -0700
From: techbook.com!techbook.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Order pizza on your autopatch now
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Brian Kantor (brian@nothing.ucsd.edu) wrote:
: In article <1765@arrl.org> jkearman.org (Jim Kearman) writes:
: >Who will be the first ham to order a pizza via autopatch? It's
: >something I've hungered to do for many years.

: Ordering pizza via phone machine (now called 'autopatches') was
: something we used to do all the time back in the early 70s, before
: the pharisees among us decided we'd all be better off if every single
: goddamn law and regulation were enforced to the letter and beyond.

Once again, the justification for my new analysis of the actual meaning of
the acronym ARRL...

The Annally Retentive Regulation Lovers!

: Of course, that was before the ARRL and other old farts had discovered
: two-meter FM. I don't think we'll ever recover from that!
: - Brian

Gene

--

Those who beat their swords into plowshares
are destined to plow for those who don't.
genew@techbook.COM

Please direct flames to: genew@ucant.gethere.frmhere

Date: 23 Jul 93 02:24:39 GMT
From: ddsww1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Policy of Reverse Autopatches, anything new?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <22kctaINN6ua@bashful.isi.com> jerry@isi.com (Jerry Gardner x323)
writes:

>Specifically, can one order pizza using a reverse autopatch? :-)

Only if the delivery person is instructed to deliver it upside-down and

walk backwards to the point of delivery. :-)

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indep1.uucp   |
|   WA9PDM     |      Use whichever one works                               |
+-----+
```

Date: 23 Jul 93 02:23:07 GMT
From: ddsww1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CAHCHC.C71@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <1993Jul21.153004.145877@locus.com>,
<22kbdiINN6ta@bashful.isi.com>
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <22kbdiINN6ta@bashful.isi.com> jerry@isi.com (Jerry Gardner x323)
writes:

>There should be a distinction here between those who argue for more
>entry barriers, such as the code test, and those who look down on
>people they feel may not have earned their place in the hobby.

And those of us who feel we've lost an important contingency factor. I've
been in places where I could just barely hit a repeater or another station,
where voice communication was out of the question; but I could always count on
being able to use some means to be understood, because the ham out there could
at least copy 5 WPM CW. Fortunately for me, I never actually needed the
capability, but I've heard from others who have needed to rely on that.

That's gone forever. Now, I have to make sure I carry a 100 AH battery
over my shoulder and strap a 50W linear onto my backpack to make sure I can
reach anyone in case of emergency. Oh, and don't forget the 11-element beam
and the RG-213U...

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indep1.uucp   |
|   WA9PDM     |      Use whichever one works                               |
+-----+
```

Date: 23 Jul 93 02:01:17 GMT
From: ddsww1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <22dsa9\$214@sun1.clark.net>, <22g212\$6b8@access.digex.net>,
<CAHtpr.5Fu@feenix.metronet.com>
Subject : Re: Order pizza on your autopatch now

In article <CAHtpR.5Fu@feenix.metronet.com> marchbg@feenix.metronet.com (Marc Grant) writes:

>

>Okay - can you order ham sandwiches?

Which begs the question, can you order from a Kosher deli, or does that constitute discrimination based on religious beliefs? And if not, what if your ham sandwich comes with a Kosher pickle? :-)

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us  OR  clifto@indep1.uucp  |
|  WA9PDM      |      Use whichever one works                        |
+-----+
```

Date: 23 Jul 93 00:58:54 GMT

From: ddsW1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CA29oH.Ks@squam.banyan.com>, <221r3aINN55t@bashful.isi.com>,

<16JUL199308294872@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>

Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <16JUL199308294872@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov> stocker@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov (ERICH FRANZ STOCKER) writes:

>No one is trying to eliminate code as an operations mode. You like it you
>use it. The question is whether speed in this area is the proper differentiator
>between a Novice and General and Advanced and Extra. Or, should that
>differentiation be theory and operating procedures including knowledge
>of the newer digital modes and satellites.

First, you say that code is an optional operating mode and therefore should not be used as a differentiator between license classes. Then you suggest that the differentiator be digital modes and satellites (and presumably meteor scatter, EME, and the like), which are optional operating modes and by your own logic as applied to the code should not be used as differentiators.

Frankly, before no-code, when I was too noisy to get speech through a repeater I could use a DTMF key to send CW if the message was important enough to warrant it. I couldn't break out my satellite dish or TNC and get through to that repeater; despite the fact that I don't have either, it simply wouldn't get the communication through.

Perhaps when my father was too feeble to talk but could squeeze my hand in Morse code, he should instead have set up his satellite dish to talk to me.

Perhaps when another ham I've seen, when he got locked in the repeater closet without a talkie or a microphone, should have set up his TNC (of

course he must have had one of THOSE handy) instead of keying the repeater on and off in CW to let people know and thus get someone to let him out.

If ANY "optional" mode should be used to differentiate, it should be CW. Frankly, my idea of a really good Extra Class test would be to lock the applicant in a room with two or three old TVs and AM radios and give him three hours to get a message out from inside the room, using an amateur frequency in any mode he chose. I'll bet those who did it successfully (all three of them) would be using CW.

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indepl.chi.il.us  OR  clifto@indepl.uucp  |
|  WA9PDM      |      Use whichever one works                        |
+-----+
```

Date: 23 Jul 93 01:34:14 GMT
From: ddsww1!indepl!clifto@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CA29oH.Ks@squam.banyan.com>,
<930713.015754.5P2.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>,
<16JUL199308062528@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <16JUL199308062528@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov> stocker@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov (ERICH FRANZ STOCKER) writes:

>It seems incredible to me that the very people who advocate morse as the
>ultimate evaluation for ham radio would be the ones who object to sending
>slower so that they can help other hams to increase speed. This attitude
>is more indicative of initiation rites than of love of the mode. It
>enables the "selected few" , the "SS" of ham radio to thumb they noses
>at the idiots who can only send 5 wpm or 13 wpm or none. All the while
>saying that the scum should be removed from amateur radio.

>

>If you are a morse code advocate, you should go out of your way to help
>others achieve the proficiency that you find so exciting. The idea is not
>to shut people out but to bring them in. We have enough segmentation in
>society. The morse fanatics are akin to the groups in society that
>discriminate against others on some one issue (e.g. race, relation,
>country of origin, etc).

>

>For those who like morse and don't want to help others -- fine! But,
>why does that mean you have to attack those that don't have the same
>approach you do. Live and let live. The hobby is big enough for the
>diversity it has and is continuing to get.

It seems incredible to me that the very people who advocate theory as the

ultimate evaluation for ham radio would be the ones who object to being asked technical questions so that they can help other hams increase proficiency. This attitude is more indicative of initiation rites than of love of theory. It enables the "selected few" , the "SS" of ham radio to thumb their noses at the idiots who can't solder a PL-259 onto a piece of coax. All the while saying that the scum should be removed from amateur radio.

If you are a theory advocate, you should go out of your way to help others achieve the proficiency that you find so exciting. The idea is not to shut people out but to bring them in. We have enough segmentation in society. The theory fanatics are akin to the groups in society that discriminate against others on some one issue (e.g. race, relation, country of origin, etc).

For those who like theory and don't want to help others -- fine! But, why does that mean you have to attack those that don't have the same approach you do. Live and let live. The hobby is big enough for the diversity it has and is continuing to get.

Turnabout is fair play.

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indepl.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indepl.uucp   |
|  WA9PDM      |      Use whichever one works                               |
+-----+
```

Date: 23 Jul 93 01:10:52 GMT
From: ddsww1!indepl!clifto@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <221r3aINN55t@bashful.isi.com>,
<16JUL199308294872@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>, <22h0qdINNlpo@network.ucsd.edu>
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <22h0qdINNlpo@network.ucsd.edu> brian@nothing.ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:

>Yes, the days when one's ability to "pound brass" was sufficient to
>guarantee entry into the elite world of amateur radio are drawing to a
>close. As the technical requirements of ham radio become greater and
>greater, the code operators will find themselves ranked with the
>has-been athletes of other forgotten sports. And about time, I say.

The "brass-pounding" days were those between the time the test went from testing the individual's ability to remember AND USE information to testing the individual's ability to memorize a few simple facts.

As the technical requirements of ham radio become greater and greater,

the test gets less and less technical. I sincerely doubt that 50% of the currently licensed Extra Class ops could pass the Novice test I took in 1965 at age 14, even if the obsolete questions (such as those about logging requirements) were removed; to think of the people I hear on the radio passing the General test I passed (at age 15) brings on laughter.

Now that one doesn't need to "pound brass", all it takes to get a license is to memorize the test pool. And from a look at the test pool, I've been tempted to persuade my wife (who can't change a light bulb) to take the no-code exam with no prior study; I have a feeling she'd pass first try.

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indep1.uucp   |
|  WA9PDM      |                               Use whichever one works   |
+-----+
```

Date: 23 Jul 93 01:52:53 GMT
From: ddsww1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <16JUL199308294872@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>,
<22hbg9INN6ju@bashful.isi.com>, <POPOVICH.93Jul20145616@cyclades.ma30.bull.com>
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <POPOVICH.93Jul20145616@cyclades.ma30.bull.com>
popovich@cyclades.ma30.bull.com (Steve Popovich) writes:
>>a requirement? You like it, you use it, but to require it is no different
>>than requiring knowledge of code.
>
>You have a point there, but the idea is again that since the license
>grants you these privileges, you can be examined on these modes.

Let me get this straight:

The license allows you this privilege	You should/should not be exam'ed
satellite	yes
EME	yes
packet	yes
CW	no
repairing a broken power cord	yes, but only marginally
meteor scatter	yes
ATV	yes
facsimile	yes
slow-scan TV	yes

Do I note an inconsistency here?

>
>Did I miss something here?
>

No, *you* didn't.

```
--  
[] [] [][] [][] Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ NCR Torrey Pines  
[] [] [] [] [] kevin.sanders@torreypinesca.ncr.com (619) 597-3602  
[] [] [][] [][] kevin%beacons@cyber.net  
[] [] [] [] []  
[] [] [] [] [][] Dump MS-DOS. Prevent Programmer Burnout with Linux.
```

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 93 19:20:48 GMT
From: ncrgw2.ncr.com!ncrhubs2!torynews!kevin@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <22hbg9INN6ju@bashful.isi.com>,
<1993Jul21.223647.27884@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>,
<1993Jul22.020659.17371@anomaly.sbs.com>
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <1993Jul22.020659.17371@anomaly.sbs.com> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>
>Amen! At long last another voice speaks the truth. Yeah, its not
>politically correct, and no doubt you're going to receive a ton of
>flame mail attempting to berate you, but rest assured that there
>are thousands of amateurs out there who agree with you. In fact,
>I daresay that the *majority* of radio amatuers (excluding the no-
>clues, that is) would agree with you, except that they would have
>to deal with the harassing flame mail if they did.
>
>The welfare-state mentality of this country has finally hit home in
>Amateur Radio. People claim it is "too hard", or
>
>#define NASAL_WHINE ON
>
>Whhhhhhhy should I have to do the code? Its out-daaaaaaated.
>
>#define NASAL_WHINE OFF
>

Geez, Michael, you're twisting my words around here. I never generalized that all no-coders were bad. I was one myself not too long ago! I was trying to say that making it easier to get into the hobby due to elimination of CW requirement for VHF, and due to dumbing down of the written exams,

has enabled people who are *not* interested in amateur radio as anything other than extended CB to enter the hobby in increasing numbers. These people are the ones I referred to as "empty calories".

Certainly there are many quality new hams out there as well, and it is easy to tell them apart from the fluff. My question to the ARRL, who I must assume is ultimately responsible for the content of the entry-level license exams, is: how can you justify making the tests easier in order to get more people involved in the hobby, when the cost may be the redefinition of the very hobby you are trying to revitalize? I don't know whether the empty calorie folks constitute a majority of no-code hams or not, but it doesn't take very many truly bad apples to thoroughly trash the VHF bands.

>Of course, amateur radio organizations like the ARRL are to blame
>as well. Especially those that supported the no-code license, and
>the VECs who are "dumbing down" the theory tests to "make it easier".
>Their motto: Quantity before Quality. After all, quantity means
>more memberships. More memberships means a greater circulation base
>for QST, and a greater circulation base means greater advertising
>revenues.

>

I'm not that cynical. I believe the ARRL has attempted to boost the amateur ranks because they think there's safety in numbers. The more hams we have, the more frequencies we use, the less apt the FCC is to take them away from us. However, even if we double or triple our numbers we are a small fish to the FCC. And if we lose the ability to police our own bands because we can't handle the slime we let into the hobby, all the more reason for the FCC to take the frequencies away.

>

>Do not despair. Other amateurs recognize this fact. Some of them are
>forming local organizations designed to keep the no-clue scum out of
>the local scene. For example, the Rhode Island 2x2 Amateur Repeater
>Association has a \$4,000 membership application fee for no-clues.
>Novices are \$2,000, Generals \$1,000, Advanced \$500, and Extra \$250.
>People who upgrade within a year of joining get a refund between the
>difference.

>

Rev., I am truly horrified! Are you actually a televangelist on the side? ;-) Seriously, what good is charging such exorbitant rates? Anyone who can afford to pay even the \$250 fee is probably rich enough he buys all his equipment and pays someone to solder his PL-259s for him. And more to the point, you are saying that you really don't care about the quality of your members, as long as they grease your palm. Maybe I should take away the above smiley.

>

>Don't be fooled by the virulent pro-no-cluers here. This is USENET.

>Bastillion of the liberal mentality borne from the Universities at
>which is was founded. Their welfare-state mentality of making it
>"fair" for everyone means the eventual elimination of all requirements.
>Already the no-cluers are crying for HF privs. Pretty soon, just open
>the box, take out your radio and your license, and get on the air.
>

The really bad apples don't need to cry for HF privs. They transmit
what they want, where they want. I know some who, among other things,
have talked on police frequencies, used their ham gear to talk on 11M
with illegal power, and jammed local repeaters. They then brag about
their "accomplishments" at the club meeting. Blleaach. Do we want to
make it easier for more of these people to become hams? I think not.

--

[] [] [] []	Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ	NCR Torrey Pines
[] [] [] [] []	kevin.sanders@torreypinesca.ncr.com	(619) 597-3602
[] [] [] [] []	kevin%beacons@cyber.net	
[] [] [] [] []		
[] [] [] [] []	Dump MS-DOS. Prevent Programmer Burnout with Linux.	

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #251
